



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,947	07/10/2001	Gerald L. Jenkins	7663/82744	9222
24628	7590	09/26/2005	EXAMINER	
WELSH & KATZ, LTD 120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA 22ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			REFAI, RAMSEY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2152	

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/901,947	JENKINS, GERALD L.
	Examiner Ramsey Refai	Art Unit 2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4, 6-15, 17-23 and 25-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 5, 16 and 24 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06/09/05 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### *Response to Amendment*

Responsive to Amendment filed on June 9, 2005. Claims 5, 6, 17, 25 have been amended.

Claims 1-27 remain pending examination.

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: "resource 28" and "responses 26". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 12-14, 17, 19-22, 25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ronen ('USPN 5,845,267).

4. Regarding claims 1 and 12, Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) teaches a system for enabling a server to contact an unknown Intenet account holder with means for:

- a. Receiving a notice from the server via a standardized communication pathway, the notice comprising a request time and a requesting IP address, and a communication (column 7, line 65 - column 8, line 1; column 5, lines 38-40).
- b. Identifying the account holder based on the requesting IP address and optionally the request time (column 8, lines 1-4).
- c. Sending the account holder the communication by an arranged manner (column 8, lines 24-29).
- d. Wherein the server need not know the identity of the account holder, and the notice need not contain information regarding the identity of the account holder (column 7, line 65 - column 8, line 1; column 5, lines 38-40). Please note that the server (merchant ISP) only has the IP address of the request. The transaction server and billing server correlate this to a user ID, the merchant server never sees the user ID.

5. Regarding claims 2 and 13, Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) teaches all the limitations

as applied to claims 1 and 12, respectively. He further teaches means wherein the step of identifying the account holder comprises checking a list of static IP addresses (column 5, lines 46-48).

6. Regarding claims 3, 14, and 22, Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) teaches all the limitations as applied to claims 1, 12, and 21, respectively. He further teaches means wherein the arranged manner is selected from the group consisting of email, fax, voice, standard mail, and destruction (column 7, line 65 - column 8, line 1; column 5, lines 3840). Note that the billing server would notify the user, if a credit card were billed, standard mail would be used to send the bill.

7. Regarding claims 6, 17, and 25, Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) teaches a system for enabling a server to contact an unknown Internet account holder with means for:

- a. Receiving a request for a resource (column 7, lines 65-66).
- b. Determining that the request for the resource warrants sending a notice to an account holder (column 7, line 65 - column 8, line 1). Please note that the transaction server determines this and forwards a message to the session server.
- c. Identifying a notice destination to which the notice is to be sent (column 8, lines 4-10). The session server is the destination in this case.
- d. Generating a notice comprising an apparent IP address, a time the server received the request, and a communication (column 8, lines 410). The transaction server queries the session server.

e. Sending the notice to the notice destination via a standardized communications pathway (column 8, lines 4-10). The request is sent to the session server.

8. Regarding claim 8, Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) teaches all the limitations as applied to claim 6. He further teaches wherein the server is a web server that is sending a response to an http request (figure 1, element 121; column 8, lines 4-10).

9. Regarding claims 19 and 27, Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) teaches all the limitations as applied to claims 17 and 25. He further teaches wherein the resource is an http resource (figure 1, element 121; column 8, lines 4-10).

10. Regarding claim 20, Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) teaches a system for enabling a server to contact an unknown Internet account holder comprising:

a. A standardized communication pathway server capable of receiving a notice (column 7, line 65 -column 8, line 1; column 5, lines 38-40).

b. A parser capable of identifying a request time, a requesting IP address from the notice and communication within the notice (column 8, lines 14).

c. A login database comprising IP addresses, request times, and accounts (column 4, line 63 - column 5, line 1).

d. Account holder communication subsystem for sending the account holder the communication (column 8, lines 24-29).

e. Wherein the server need not know the identity of the account holder, and the notice need not contain information regarding the identity of the account holder (column 7, line 65 - column 8, line 1; column 5, lines 38-40). Please note that the server (merchant ISP) only has the IP address of the request. The transaction server and billing server correlate this to a user ID, the merchant server never sees the user ID.

11. Regarding claim 21, Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) teaches all the limitations as applied to claims 1 and 12, respectively. He further teaches means wherein the login database comprises a list of static IP addresses (column 5, lines 46-48).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 4, 11, 15, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) in view of Grassle (USPN 6,785,824).

14. Regarding claim 4, Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) teaches all the limitations as applied to claim 1. He further teaches means for checking one or more files comprising a database comprising dynamic IP addresses, accounts, and times, and the request time is the time at which

the server received the requests (column 8, lines 1-4). Although the system disclosed by Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose specifically means wherein the communication pathway is email. Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Ronen (USPN 5,845,267), as evidenced by Grassle (USPN 6,785,824).

In an analogous art, Grassle (USPN 6,785,824) discloses a system for sending messages based on Internet usage wherein the communication pathway is email (figure 2, element 108).

Given the teaching of Grassle (USPN 6,785,824), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) by employing email for contacting a user. This is a common form of communication on the Internet and benefits the system by making the message immediately available to a user.

15. Regarding claim 11, although the system disclosed by Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) (as applied to claim 6) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose specifically means wherein the standardized communication pathway is email. Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Ronen (USPN 5,845,267), as evidenced by Grassle (USPN 6,785,824).

In an analogous art, Grassle (USPN 6,785,824) discloses a system for sending messages based on Internet usage wherein the standard communication pathway is email (figure 2, element 108).

Given the teaching of Grassle (USPN 6,785,824), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) by employing email for contacting a user. This is a common form of communication on the Internet and benefits the system by making the message immediately available to a user.

16. Regarding claim 15, Ronen (USPN 5,845,2677 teaches all the limitations as applied to claim 12. He further teaches means for identifying an account holder using dynamic IP addresses, accounts, and times, and the request time is the time at which the server received the requests (column 8, lines 1-4).

Although the system disclosed by Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose specifically means wherein the standardized communication pathway is email.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Ronen (USPN 5,845,267), as evidenced by Grassle (USPN 6,785,824).

In an analogous art, Grassle (USPN 6,785,824) discloses a system for sending messages based on Internet usage wherein the standardized communication pathway is email (figure 2, element 108).

Given the teaching of Grassle (USPN 6,785,824), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) by employing email for contacting a user. This is a common form of communication on the Internet and benefits the system by making the message immediately available to a user. 2

17. Regarding claim 23, Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) teaches all the limitations as applied to claim 21. He further teaches means wherein the login database comprises dynamic IP addresses, accounts, and times (column 8, lines 1-4).

Although the system disclosed by Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose specifically means wherein the standardized communication pathway server is an email server.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Ronen (USPN 5,845,267), as evidenced by Grassle (USPN 6,785,824).

In an analogous art, Grassle (USPN 6,785,824) discloses a system for sending messages based on Internet usage wherein the standardized communication pathway server is an email server (figure 2, element 108).

Given the teaching of Grassle (USPN 6,785,824), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) by employing email for contacting a user. This is a common form of communication on the Internet and benefits the system by making the message immediately available to a user.

18. Claims 7, 10, 18, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) in view of McClain et al. (USPN 6,722,214).

19. Regarding claims 7, 18, and 26, although the system disclosed by Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) (as applied to claims 6, 17, and 25, respectively) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means for warning a user that fulfilling the request for a resource will result in the sending of a notice.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Ronen (USPN 5,845,267), as evidenced by McClain et al. (USPN 6,722,214).\\

In an analogous art, McClain et al. (USPN 6,722,214) discloses a system for evaluating web requests with means for warning a user that fulfilling the request for a resource will result in the sending of a notice (column 11, lines 20-25).

Given the teaching of McClain et al, (USPN 6,722,214), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) by employing the warning of users that a notice may be sent. This benefits the system by allowing a user to choose not to access content or purchase something if it is known that charges will be incurred or if the material is inappropriate.

20. Regarding claim 10, although the system disclosed by Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) (as applied to claim 8) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the response to the hypertext transfer protocol request contains hypertext code that enables a caching server to send notices on behalf of the server.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Ronen (USPN 5,845,267), as evidenced by McClain et al. (USPN 6,722,214).

In an analogous art, McClain et al. (USPN 6,722,214) discloses a system for evaluating web requests wherein the response to the hypertext transfer protocol request contains hypertext code that enables a caching server to send notices on behalf of the server (abstract; column 11, lines 20-25).

Given the teaching of McClain et al. (USPN 6,722,214), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) by employing a cache server that can send messages in place of the origin server. This benefits the system by ensuring that cached data is protected from inappropriate access or charges even though it is not newly downloaded from the server.

21. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) in view of Forlenza et al. (USPN 6,725,380).

22. Regarding claim 9, although the system disclosed by Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) (as applied to claim 8) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the response to the hypertext transfer protocol request contains hypertext code that aids in preventing the caching of the Web page.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Ronen (USPN 5,845,267), as evidenced by Forlenza et al. (USPN 6,725,380).

In an analogous art, Forlenza et al. (USPN 6,725,380) discloses a system for ensuring security in Internet usage wherein the response to the hypertext transfer protocol request contains hypertext code that aids in preventing the caching of the Web page (column 7, lines 16-21).

Given the teaching of Forlenza et al. (USPN 6,725,380), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Ronen (USPN 5,845,267) by preventing the caching of some content. This benefits the system by protecting the user from future accesses of inappropriate or personal information.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

23. Claims 5, 16 and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

24. Applicant's arguments filed June 9, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- In the remarks, the Applicant argues in substance that:
  - a. Romen does not disclose account holder, as defined in the specification, as a person responsible for an Internet access accounts;

- b. Romen discloses a “user” not an account holder.
- In response to argument:
  - a. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., account holder as a person responsible of an Internet access account) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
  - b. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Romen teaches a session manager that translates a connection ID used to identify the user connection into a corresponding IP address which in turn is translated into a user's ID from which the user's account can be accessed (see column 2, lines 45-67). Therefore Romen meets the scope of the claimed limitation.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramsey Refai whose telephone number is (571) 272-3975. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ramsey Refai  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2152

September 19, 2005



**ZARNI MAUNG**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER